THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

21 May 1998

AM 10:30 CONVENE, National Gallery of Art, 6th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC

I. SUBMISSION AND REVIEW
(This section of the meeting will be held in the West Building lecture hall at the National Gallery.)

National Park Service/American Battle Monuments Commission

CFA 21/MAY/98-1, World War II Memorial. The Rainbow Pool at 17th Street in West Potomac Park. Revised design. (Previous: CFA 24/JUL/97-1.)

II. ADMINISTRATION
(Following lunch, the meeting will reconvene in the conference room of the Commission of Fine Arts, 441 F Street, NW, Washington, DC.)

A. Approval of minutes:

16 April 1998

B. Dates of next meetings:

18 June
23 July

C. Introduction of new staff member, Frederick Lindstrom.

III. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Park Service

1. CFA 21/MAY/98-2, Lafayette Square. North side security modifications. Bollard design in street right-of-way; Jackson Place and Madison Place. (Previous: CFA 19/MAR/98-1.)

2. CFA 21/MAY/98-3, National Japanese American Memorial. Louisiana Avenue between New Jersey Avenue and D Street, NW. Landscape and sculpture elements. Design development. (Previous: CFA 20/NOV/97-8.)

B. The John F. Kennedy Center For The Performing Arts

CFA 21/May/98-4, Roof terrace safety railing. Design development, preferred scheme. (Previous: CFA 19/FEB/98-5.)

C. Department of the Army

CFA 21/MAY/98-5, Fort Myer, physical fitness center. Parking area and landscape. Design.

D. Department of the Treasury/U.S. Mint

CFA 21/MAY/98-6, Fifty states circulating/ commemorative quarter. Reverse designs for second through fifth states: Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, Connecticut. (Previous: CFA 16/APR/98-2; Delaware.)

E. General Services Administration/Department of State

CFA 21/MAY/98-7, Main State Building, 21st and C Streets, NW. Security bollards and planters; three locations. Optional designs.

F. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. OG 98-66, 3100 South Street. Georgetown Incinerator site. Millennium Georgetown Development: residential/inn/theatre complex. Revised concept. (Previous: CFA 19/MAR/98; information presentation.)

b. OG 98-94, 27th, 28th and Olive Streets, NW. Phillips Row Project; 14 new townhouses. Design development. (Previous: CFA 20/NOV/97; OG 97-147 and 148.)

c. Appendix I.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. SL 98-48, 2600 Rock Creek Drive, NW. Hightower residence. Design development. (Previous: CFA 22/JAN/98; SL 98-33.)

b. SL 98-57, 2500 Calvert Street, NW. OMNI Shoreham Hotel; landscape, terraces, fountains. Conceptual.

c. Appendix II.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 97-93 HPA. 97-230	3333 P Street, N.W. Thomas Rutherford Residence	Addition of third floor - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for rear third floor addition as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 6 May 1998. Submit working drawings with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 98-59 HPA. 98-160	3254 O Street, N.W. Craig and Mary Goodman Residence	Second floor addition over garage off alley - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for addition of gable roof over one story garage off alley as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 8 May 1998. Submit working drawings, including side elevation, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 98-87 HPA. 98-212	1608 32nd Street, N.W. Brian Weaver Residence	Addition of entry vestibule - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition of vestibule as shown in "Option B" received and dated May 1998. Supplemental drawings indicate flat roof over vestibule, painted wood surround and door, and 3-inch downspout that will connect to existing drain. Brick on vestibule entry wall will match existing brick. Installation of approved vestibule will require the removal of existing door and pediment installed without permit. Note: supplemental drawings also indicate stone runners over brick steps and new gutters on main roof of house which had been installed prior to review.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 98-90 HPA. 98-215	3131 M Street, N.W. Samuel M. Levy Johnny Rockets	Signs - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for one proposed sign on front facade and one on alley wall as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 15 May April 1998, which indicate depth of signs is 3 inches. Submit detailed drawings with permit application when ready.

O.G. 98-91 HPA. 98-216	3131 M Street, N.W. Samuel M. Levy Johnny Rockets	Alterations to storefront - revised design - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to storefront, including gooseneck light fixtures and painting the walls, as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 15 May 1998.

O.G. 98-97 HPA. 98-254	2929 N Street, N.W. Lynch and Camalier Residence	Alterations to existing porches - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed enclosure of two side porches with glazing similar in configuration to that of existing windows as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 1 May 1998. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Action (O.G. 98-27). NOTE: Applicant indicated that entry door and windows removed during accidental fire will be restored and/or replaced-in-kind.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 98-99 HPA. 98-261	2911 O Street, N.W. Sullivan Residence	Rear addition and alterations - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for rear addition and alterations to existing garage as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 23 April 1998, provided gate separating parking pad from driveway is paneled to screen parked vehicles. Submit working drawings with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 98-100 HPA. 98-262	3109 N Street, N.W. Noel Miller Residence	Fence replacement - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed work on garden fence which is repair, maintenance and replacement-in-kind of existing fence.

O.G. 98-101 HPA. 98-263	3126 N Street, N.W. Steven R. Schutt Residence	Rear addition, garden fence, and replacement windows - permit

ACTION: Returned without Action. Proposed work is not visible from public space. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

O.G. 98-102 HPA. 98-265	1258 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Jenko Company GAP	Replacement sign and projecting signs - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement signs reading "GAP". Applicant will maintain lettering on valance of awnings as previously approved, and has removed proposed projecting signs from this permit application.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 98-103 HPA. 98-266	1267 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Metro Home Property Mgmt. GAP Kids	Replacement signs and projecting signs - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement signs reading: "GAP Kids". Applicant has agreed to remove projecting signs from this permit application

---

O.G. 98-104 HPA. 98-267	1251 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Khosrow Mizrahi Commercial	Alterations to rear - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to rear. Applicant has agreed to face exterior walls with brick and use iron gate off alley. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Action (O.G. 98-45).

O.G. 98-106 HPA. 98-269	1600 30th Street, N.W. David Mastran Residence	Alterations and in-fill of porch - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations and in-fill of openings in existing porch. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Action (O.G. 98-61).

O.G. 98-107 HPA. 98-270	3700 O Street, N.W. Georgetown University Main Gate	Alterations for new gates and handicapped ramps - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to main entrance gates to the Georgetown University campus, including new handicapped access ramps, landscaping and replica piers, gates and light fixtures.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 98-108 HPA. 98-271	1524 30th Street, N.W. Springsteen and Hook Residence	Addition and deck on side yard - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for addition and deck on side yard. Submit working drawings with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 98-109 HPA. 98-273	3141 P Street, N.W. Noel Evans Residence	Revisions to approved rear addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed one story addition at rear of existing residence or to brick garden wall.

O.G. 98-110 HPA. 98-274	2712 O Street, N.W. Robert Schick Residence	Alterations to front and rear 2 -story addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to front and for 2-story addition at rear. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Action (O.G. 98-73).

O.G. 98-111 HPA. 98-275	3124 Q Street, N.W. Herbert and Patrice Miller Bowie-Sevier House Residence	Alterations to driveway, hyphen roofs, terrace and conservatory - design development - conceptual

ACTION: Returned without Action. Case withdrawn by written request of the applicant.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 98-112 HPA. 98-276	3404 R Street, N.W. Thomas Residence	Alterations to rear window openings - conceptual

ACTION: Returned without Action. Proposed work is not visible from public space. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

O.G. 98-113 HPA. 98-277	3027 Q Street, N.W. Woodward and Walsh Residence	Rear 2-story addition - revised design - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed rear 2-story addition as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 1 May 1998. Working drawings conform to recommendations given during concept review. See previous Action (O.G. 98-86).

O.G. 98-114 HPA. 98-278	1515 31st Street, N.W. Mr. and Mrs. Cunningham Residence	Alteration to window opening for bay window - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed removal of A/C units from front facade, or for replacement windows on side and rear, as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 15 May 1998. Note: supplemental drawings indicate that proposed addition of bay window on front of house, which is out of character with architectural style of the building, has been deleted from this permit application.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 98-115 HPA. 98-279	3137 N Street, N.W. Richard Tetlie Residence	Second floor addition over garage off alley - permit

ACTION: Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for second floor addition over garage off alley which, as proposed is out of character with the one story structures in alley. Recommend further study of a gable roof addition. Resubmit new working drawings for alternative with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 98-116 HPA. 98-282	2900 N Street, N.W. James M. Costan Residence	Side wall and metal railing, and replacement of retaining wall - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed introduction of a brick base for re-used existing iron fence along 29th Street provided stepping down of wall relates to condition of existing railing, as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated May 1998. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Action (O.G. 98-95).

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 98-25 HPA. 98-95	748 Jackson Place, N.W. National Trust for Historic Preservation Decatur House	Alterations to steps, new railing and awning cover - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new railing on steps to entrance to Decatur House Museum Shop as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 6 May 1998, as a temporary measure ONLY. No objection to replacement of canvas over existing awning frame with lettering reading "Decatur House Museum Shop" on valance ONLY, since lettering on side panels of awning does not meet DC Code. No objection to repair work on steps.

S.L. 98-52	2600 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. R & J Inc. Nic Nac Deli	Sidewalk cafe - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed sidewalk cafe on public space provided there are no signs or lettering on umbrellas.

S.L. 98-53	4155 Linnean Avenue, N.W. Hillwood Museum 7 Gardens Main entrance gate	New guardhouse and alterations to gate - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept designs for alterations to existing guardhouse and for new guardhouse at main entrance gate to the Hillwood Museum and Gardens, provided that mechanical equipment is hidden from view within new structure. Submit working drawings, including details and information on automatic gate, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 98-54	1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Au Bon Pain	Sidewalk cafe - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed sidewalk cafe, provided there are no signs or lettering on umbrellas. See previous Action (S.L. 97-40).

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

21 May 1998

The meeting was convened at 10:45 a.m. in the lecture room of the west building of the National Gallery of Art, 6th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., for review of the revised design for the World War II Memorial, after an inspection of a mock-up of the design on the site. The meeting was later reconvened at the Commission's offices in the National Building Museum, 441 F Street, N.W. for the review of the remaining items on the agenda.

Members present: Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Hon. Harry G. Robinson III, Vice-Chairman
Hon. Carolyn Brody
Hon. Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel
Hon. Ann Todd Free
Hon. Emily Malino
Hon. Eden Rafshoon

National Capital Planning Commission staff present: Ms. Nancy Witherell

I. SUBMISSION AND REVIEW

National Park Service/American Battle Monuments Commission

CFA 21/MAY/98-1, World War II Memorial. The Rainbow Pool at 17th Street in West Potomac Park. Revised design. The Chairman explained the format for this presentation, saying that members of Congress would be heard first, followed by those directly involved with the design; then testimony would be heard from individuals speaking in favor of the design followed by those opposed. He introduced Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur as the first speaker.

Ms. Kaptur said the proposed memorial, on its historically significant site in the nation's capital, would mark for all time the legacy of World War II, the world it shaped and the freedom it preserved. She thanked all those who had contributed to the progress already made, and she

submitted for the record a letter signed by 100 members of the House urging the Commission to move expeditiously in its deliberations, and a similar letter signed by 76 members of the Senate.

Ms. Kaptur commented on Friedrich St. Florian's revised design, noting that it reflected the advice given by the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission. She said the new design would retain the open vistas along the Mall as well as the elm trees in the vicinity of the Rainbow Pool; it would also substantially rehabilitate the pool itself and enhance the area with waterfalls and additional landscaping.

Ms. Kaptur said that as work on the memorial moved forward she had continued to be inspired by the enthusiasm of Roger Durbin, the combat veteran who had first talked to her about a memorial a decade ago. At every step of the way there had been bipartisan support and the knowledge that when the history of the twentieth century was written, the victory of liberty over tyranny would rest as the century's most profound achievement. That achievement would now be recognized on the national Mall, by a memorial to a nation, a people, and a time that would always reverberate in the pages of history.

The Chairman then asked Senator John Warner for his comments. Senator Warner recalled his service as a very young man during the last days of the war, and his early years in the Senate when over half the membership consisted of World War II veterans. Now, he said, there were only about a dozen, and he noted that this was a reminder of the rate of death of these veterans and the need to move expeditiously to get the memorial built. He said it would serve not only as a reminder of the sacrifices of the World War II generation, but as a warning of the ever-present dangers to liberty and freedom. He recalled working with the Chairman on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, and said he trusted the Commission to come up with an equally fine solution to the design problems of the World War II Memorial.

There being no more members of Congress to testify, the Chairman opened the discussion to representatives of government agencies involved in the construction of the memorial. The first speaker was John Parsons from the National Park Service, National Capital Region.

Mr. Parsons said he would like to share with the Commission the Park Service's enthusiasm for the revised design, especially because it gave a sense of place to the Rainbow Pool while protecting the trees, topography, and vistas so important to the Mall. He said the Park Service had always felt the site was the best one to commemorate the major

event of the century, and he thought the memorial would act as an excellent complement to the Grant Memorial at the Capitol Reflecting Pool. He said the Park Service was engaged in the environmental assessment process, and he believed his agency had responded to the many concerns that were expressed a year ago; he said he did not think the memorial would have an intrusive effect on the landscape. Mr. Parsons then introduced Ambassador Haydn Williams from the American Battle Monuments Commission.

Ambassador Williams first acknowledged the members of the Site and Design Committee of the American Battle Monuments Commission with whom he had been working. Then he read a passage from historian and World War II veteran William Manchester commenting on the aging of the veterans and the need to honor them before the 20th century closed. He said another step would be taken toward that goal with the Commission's consideration of a revised design for an incomparable site of great beauty on the center line of America's history, the national Mall. He said the Battle Monuments Commission recognized that placing anything there had to be done with great skill and sensitivity, and he thought St. Florian's revised design did that. He noted that it was substantially different from the one presented earlier--the biggest difference being the elimination of all interior space--but still contained elements of the winning scheme, beginning with the lowered Memorial Plaza and pool. He said they were asking at this stage for concept approval of an overall scheme, including basic architectural elements and landscaping features, with details to follow in the ongoing review process.

With concept approval, consideration of content would begin in earnest. Ambassador Williams said it had already begun, and the memorial would be given meaning through art in various forms, iconography, and inscriptions. The principal themes and messages would include national unity and the moral strength and power of a people united in a just cause against tyranny; the heroic achievement of our armed forces; the sacrifice, suffering, and the cost in human life; and finally, American optimism, the hope for lasting peace, and the passing of the torch of freedom from one generation to the next.

Ambassador Williams said the western wall, with Lincoln in the background, would be the memorial's strongest and most sacred place. Here the ceremonies would be held, remembering and honoring the 406,000 Americans killed during the war. When built, the World War II Memorial would add to the symbolism and the historical experience of the Mall, representing a linkage with the ideals of our national past and a faith in its future. The Memorial Plaza would be a place for commemoration and repose, but also a welcoming,

place for commemoration and repose, but also a welcoming, democratic gathering place for the celebration of American patriotism, for sunset parades and memorial concerts.

Ambassador Williams closed by noting that World War II was no ordinary time; it was a time when America saved the world, a time which forever changed American life and the direction of world history. He said he hoped that those who visited the memorial would learn not only of the sacrifices made to preserve freedom in history's greatest and bloodiest war, but would confirm their own dedication to the common ideals which inspired such sacrifices. He referred to the revised design as one with "a pervasive sense of quiet dignity", and then introduced the architect, Friedrich St. Florian.

Mr. St. Florian introduced his design team: George Hartman of Hartman-Cox, associate design architects; James Van Sweden of Oehme & Van Sweden, landscape architects; and Leo A. Daly, architects and engineers of record. He said the revised design concept had taken its inspiration from the site itself--the Rainbow Pool and the existing topography were its generators. He felt that it fit naturally and organically into the site, enhanced it, and was respectful and cognizant of its surroundings. The open vistas and secondary views below the tree canopies would remain, and the memorial itself would be considerably smaller; it would fit within the curvilinear double row of elm trees.

Mr. St. Florian then described the features of his design. There would be three entrances into the Memorial Plaza: a large ceremonial entrance with stairs and ramps from 17th Street, and curvilinear ramp systems at the north and south perimeters of the site. These would be surmounted by embracing "arms" of metal and stone, consisting of metal shield-like architectural structures transparent enough to allow for views into and out from the plaza, and anchored at the center by monumental granite arches. The fifty-six shields, one for each state and territory at the time of World War II, would be major carriers of meaning and symbolism, with nine-foot-high laurel wreaths in each shield signifying the unity of the nation during the war. The granite arches, rising 42 feet above the plaza and 36 feet above the exterior grounds, would mark the point of entry into the memorial grounds from either the north or south side of the Mall. The arches and the large, bronze laurel wreaths suspended within them would celebrate the victory won, the triumph of liberty over tyranny.

The ceremonial center of the memorial would be at the western apex of the memorial, where a curved granite wall would form an exedra with cascading waterfalls on either side

Rainbow Pool. In this place the sacrifice and heroism of the World War II generation would be commemorated, and here would be placed a torch of freedom, passed symbolically from generation to generation.

A memorial plaza would surround the Rainbow Pool, offering a place for gatherings and pageantry but also for contemplation and meditation. There would be a combination of paved and grass surfaces, with shrubs and other perennial plantings; the color scheme would be green and white. The outer precincts of the 7.4-acre site would also be landscaped, featuring a canopy of flowering trees and shrubs, with pedestrian pathways leading to small shaded seating areas for contemplation and remembrance. The Rainbow Pool itself would have its water jets restored, and the ancient metaphor of the rainbow signaling fair weather after a storm would receive a new meaning. Two other fountains would be located at the base of each of the two arches. At the 17th Street entrance to the site there would be two 70-foot-high flagpoles, carefully designed with beautiful bases.

Mr. St. Florian said that as a designer it had been a humbling experience to work on a project of such historic significance, in the presence of the awe-inspiring monuments erected to Washington and Lincoln. He said many saw the Washington Monument as a symbol of the birth of the modern democratic nation, a utopian vision of a land where all men would be free and equal. This was challenged but ultimately confirmed by the Civil War, as symbolized by the Lincoln Memorial. By the end of the 20th century, democracy was fully established, not only in the United States but around the world; Mr. St. Florian said he saw the World War II Memorial on the Mall as a symbol of the final triumph of democracy.

The next speaker was Herman Harrington, representing the American Legion. Mr. Harrington first saluted the Commission for the work it had done in the past to honor the nation's veterans. He said he had supported the first design for the World War II Memorial, but had not really had any warm feelings for it and was concerned, as were others, that it might mar the view from certain places on the Mall. When he saw the new design, however, he felt it had real power, and he could see the inscriptions, and the flowers left next to the name of a campaign, and hear the soothing sound of water. He said this would not be just an edifice to look at, but to feel, a place where future generations would remember the sacrifices of his generation, sacrifices that would have to be made if the nation were to remain free. He said testimonials to valor were not needed--this was provided by Iwo Jima--and museums with artifacts could be provided by the Smithsonian. What was needed was the hallowed place of memory designed by Mr. St. Florian, in the location the Commission had already

approved, "in the heart of the nation's capital and the heart of our nation's consciousness". He thought questions of traffic, helicopter landing pads and fireworks launching were minor problems and could be solved.

Mr. Harrington noted that there was one crucial element that had to be considered: time. He noted that the death rate for World War II veterans was 1,000 per day, and that less than half of the 16 million men and women who served were still living. He said he hoped the memorial could be built in time for them to enjoy it.

The next speaker was David Childs, architect and partner in the firm of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill in New York, and former chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission. Mr. Childs noted also that he had been involved with the design of Constitution Gardens while with the SOM office in Washington, and that he had been a member of the Design Selection Committee that had picked Mr. St. Florian's design for the World War II Memorial.

Mr. Childs recalled that when the members of the McMillan Commission were laying out the Mall, the design of the Rainbow Pool and the area around it had never been completely resolved, and he saw Mr. St. Florian's World War II Memorial design as the perfect way to do this; he observed that the various elements, classical in feeling and scale, fit the space and defined it, without adding architecture to this very sensitive spot on the Mall or impeding the great east-west axis. He commented that while the elements of the design came from the classical vocabulary, they were interpreted in a fresh way, and the materials--stone, metal, grass, trees and water--had been brought together in a gardenesque way that he found most appropriate to the site. Mr. Childs said he endorsed the design highly and recommended that the Commission do the same.

The next speaker was landscape architect Laurie Olin. He said he found the revised design a vast improvement on the original, and he thought it would greatly enhance and improve the landscape of that part of the Mall by clarifying and unify ing the disparate elements already there: the Reflecting Pool and the allée of trees along it, the Rainbow Pool, Constitution Gardens, 17th Street, and the base of the hill on which the Washington Monument stands. He found the scheme calm and dignified, the classical elements well-suited to its site, and its scale generous enough to accommodate the iconographic and narrative devices necessary to honor the people and events of World War II. He did not think it would disrupt or compromise any of the cherished features of the Mall, and it would enhance an area that was "a bit vapid" at present. It would keep the elements of merit--the Rainbow

Pool and the elm trees--and add fountains, walks, generous new planting, places to sit, accommodation for parking of buses, and finally, a dignified memorial to the enormous sacrifice and efforts of millions of Americans in the cause of democracy and peace. Mr. Olin then endorsed the scheme highly and recommended it to the Commission.

Robert Peck, Commissioner of Public Buildings at GSA, was the next speaker. He commented that it was his agency that had organized the design competition on behalf of the American Battle Monuments Commission that had resulted in the selection of Mr. St. Florian as architect for the memorial. He said they knew at the time that competitions often selected the designer with the best thinking about a project, not necessarily the design that would eventually be built, and in this case, that was what had happened. As a former member of the Commission of Fine Arts, Mr. Peck said the World War II Memorial showed that the Commission's process had worked; in response to the Commission's recommendations, the client had revised the design but had kept its integrity.

Mr. Peck said he had spent most of his life in Washington and a lot of time running on the Mall, and he thought it was important to separate history from myth when talking about that sacred piece of ground. He noted that L'Enfant's Mall consisted of a grand boulevard flanked by imposing buildings--somewhat like the Champs Elysées; when the McMillan Commission redesigned it it became quite a different space--the one we know now--and had been extended by nearly two-thirds into a newly-filled area that had been part of the Potomac River during L'Enfant's time. He said that while the Mall was used most of the time as a promenade, it could appropriately accommodate large-scale events of a greatly differing nature--protests, the Folklife Festival, religious revivals--and memorials to momentous events; he said L'Enfant, Washington, and Jefferson had all suggested that as the city grew it would need and get more memorials. He thought that in the case of this memorial, the design had evolved to the point where it clearly warranted the Commission's support.

Mr. Peck said in closing that he would like to say a word about architectural style. He thought it was hurtful and untrue to history to compare the architectural style of this memorial or any other in the neoclassical mode to that used by the totalitarian regimes that were defeated in World War II. He said just looking around Washington at our public buildings built in the 1930s and 1940s and comparing them with those built in Germany and Italy during the same period would show that there was little, if any, difference in style. He observed that we bring to architectural symbols the values that are within us--good or bad.

As Mr. Peck's comments were the last in the actual presentation of the design, the Chairman declared a short recess and then reconvened the meeting to hear testimony from those in support of the design.

The first speaker was Stanley Witchusic, immediate past president of the Veterans of the Battle of the Bulge. Mr. Witchusic recalled the terrible days of that battle, the still-grateful people of Europe who have memorials at nearly every crossroads to the GIs who liberated their country, and said he found it troublesome that there was still no memorial in Washington, D.C. He recounted a visit he had made to a veterans hospital and the frequently-asked questions: Is there really going to be a memorial in Washington? Will any of us live to see it? Mr. Witchusic said his organization had asked him to appeal for speedy approval of the Mall site and the revised design.

Albert Lerner, representing the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, said his organization was very pleased with the new design. However, he noted that there was nothing on the drawings that indicated what had happened during the war and what the men and women who fought had done for future generations. He suggested that each one of the elm trees carry a plaque with a division's name, so that children could see them and be told in which division their grandfathers served and received their medals.

The next speaker was Paul Brace, a World War II veteran, retired urban planner and landscape architect, and resident of Washington for over thirty years. He said he commended the Commission for rejecting the first design as not suitable to the Mall, and the architects for coming up with a design that respected it. He said he would like to comment on two things--the treatment of the site and the design concept. In regard to the site, he was afraid the walls might have a commercial character, and he thought both the monumental arches and the laurel wreaths were anachronistic. He was also concerned that the view of the Lincoln Memorial in the Reflecting Pool might not be kept intact. Mr. Brace did not like commemorating the states on the shields because he thought the stress should be on the unity of the nation; the shields should honor various divisions of the armed forces. The theatres of operation, the great commanders, the great moments--D-Day landings, the Battle of the Bulge, Corregidor, etc.--the home front, the technical advances--Jeeps, K-rations, Bailey bridges--all should be represented.

Bill Rolen, executive director of the American Ex-Prisoners of War, said his group approved the design and supported the statements made by Representative Kaptur and Senator Warner. He asked that the memorial be built as soon

as possible, noting that the average age of the surviving ex-prisoners was seventy-six.

Another ex-prisoner of war, Robert Van Holt, commented on the popularity of the recently-opened Prisoner of War Museum in Andersonville, Florida, and said he was sure the World War II Memorial would have the same appeal.

Kenneth Haapalla, member of the board of the Brotherhood of the Knights of the Vine, said he had been asked by the veterans in his organization to speak on behalf of the memorial. He said he would like to dispel two "red herrings" he had heard in regard to the site and design. The first was that it violated L'Enfant's plan, and he noted that another speaker had explained that the site was under water at the time of L'Enfant. The second concerned the statement that some of the classical elements were Fascist. He recalled several truly Fascist monuments, noting their design elements and enormous size and said he did not see any of those characteristics in Mr. St. Florian's design. He closed by saying that the defining events of the 18th and 19th centuries--the Revolution and the Civil War--could be recalled by visits to their battlefields, but the defining event of the 20th century, World War II, was not fought in this country, and he thought a central focus for the sacrifice and courage of those who fought was sorely needed; he asked that the memorial as redesigned be built.

The Secretary noted that the next group of speakers would be testifying in opposition to the memorial. The first was Jim McGrath.

Mr. McGrath said he was a longtime Washington resident and a veteran, and while he agreed there should be a World War II memorial and had no particular objection to the design being proposed, he was unalterably opposed to the site. He thought the sweeping axis connecting the Lincoln Memorial, Washington Monument, and the Capitol was in danger of being destroyed forever, and the entire enterprise was "plainly monumentalism and memorialism run amok".

Architect Elena Sturdza spoke next. She said first that she found the new design well-balanced with many good features, but she thought it was inappropriate for the site because it had a negative rather than a positive impact. She found the reduction in size of the Rainbow Pool a mistake, but she was particularly concerned about the lowering, feeling that the reflections in the pool would be lost, the rainbows would not be visible, and the views of all the monuments would disappear; also, the two arches would block views as would the metal fence, which would be over 9 feet off the ground.

Ms. Sturdza's second main point was that the design was too modest, too timid to be a suitable memorial for World War II. She said it did not sufficiently honor sacrifice, and there was no evocation of victory and glory; furthermore, there was no celebration of the emergence of the United States as a world leader, a role model for democracy. Lastly, Ms. Sturdza said she did not think the memorial design was well-integrated with the rest of the Mall.

Charles Cassell, a retired architect and historic preservationist, was the next speaker. He recalled that he had testified against the Mall site for the World War II Memorial at the 24 July 1997 meeting from the viewpoint of historic preservation; he thought the Mall was not a work in progress but a completed work of art, meant to celebrate the goals of a young and hopeful nation: freedom, openness, and democratic participation in the affairs of government. Although he agreed that the new design was a great improvement over its predecessor, it still celebrated war and was therefore not appropriate for the Mall. Mr. Cassell's last point was that the Section 106 process had not yet been initiated by the Park Service, and he urged the Commission not to approve any design concept until this had been completed.

Architect Robert Miller was the next speaker. He commented on the British architect and writer Peter Smithson's observations on the American use of space, "the language of American urbanism", and said the Mall was the example par excellence of the American use of space; it created the spatial setting against which we read the independence and importance of our institutions and monuments. He thought Mr. St. Florian's design, which would create an enclosed precinct with a 7-foot level change, would contradict the essence of the Mall.

Steven Dennis, a member of the Committee of 100, addressed two issues covered in the Draft Environmental Assessment-- the "contaminated and unstable" soils on the site. He said the contamination by petroleum hydrocarbons was considered serious and would require removal and replacement of significant portions of soil. Also, the assessment stated that the soil on the site had very poor properties for most engineering applications and that foundations would have to go down at least 27 feet. Mr. Dennis said he thought this showed that any significant construction on the site would be difficult, involving a massive excavation and soil replacement project.

Deborah Dietsch, a writer on architecture, was the next speaker. She said she had testified last year in opposition to the size and location of the World War II Memorial and still maintained that a memorial to a 20th century war did not

belong on the Mall's most sacred ground between the two most potent symbols of our democracy, which represented the enduring strength of the nation from the 18th through the 19th centuries. Also, she thought the memorial could benefit the entire city if it were built downtown; in that location it would carry out NCPC's strategy for using memorials to bring economic development to neighborhoods.

Ms. Diesch commended the ABMC and Mr. St. Florian for having listened to the criticism of the first design and for having responded with a smaller, lower, and more respectful version. But she did not find victory and valor or the achievements of the home front strongly conveyed by the anachronistic Beaux-Arts architecture, and she did not think the addition of inscriptions, state seals, laurel wreaths, and a torch of freedom would help.

Ms. Dietsch also criticized several elements of the design. She did not like the barrier across the Mall created by the structure at the west end of the memorial, saying that it would destroy the freedom to move freely along the Mall, which she saw as fundamental to the democratic spirit. She thought the Memorial Plaza should be raised to welcome people from all sides, and that the walls, ramps, and arches should be lowered so that unobstructed views of the Mall could be had from inside the enclosure. The Lincoln Memorial should be visible from all directions, not just through a notch in the west wall, and the outlines of the Reflecting Pool should be kept intact and not blurred by the memorial's water features. The many white stone surfaces should be reconsidered as they would be blinding in the sunlight, night lighting should be designed so that it would not interfere with the reflections of the Washington Monument in the Reflecting Pool, and provisions for fireworks staging should be carefully thought out. Finally, Ms. Dietsch said she was concerned that this memorial would set a dangerous precedent in encouraging further memorialization on the Mall, and she urged the Commission to work with the Planning Commission to revise the Commemorative Works Act and toughen its procedures for placing memorials on the Mall.

The last speaker was Judy Feldman, assistant professor of art history at American University. She said she walked the Mall several times a year with her students, discussing the history of the city and the Mall and the monuments on it. She said she had testified last year and this year was testifying on behalf of the Committee of 100.

Ms. Feldman said the Commission was being asked to approve a concept, yet the concept was not clear; there was no architectural, landscape, or memorial vocabulary to hold it together and make for a truly moving human experience. Also,

it would change the Mall physically and symbolically with it sunken granite plaza, high framing fence of stone and metal, and severely controlled access.

Ms. Feldman said she had three principal questions about the design. The first was, is the design architecture or landscape? The columns and berms were dropped from the first scheme and the trees retained, but a granite and metal fence was added around the space, the plaza was sunk 7-feet and lined with more stone, and access was restricted on the north and south and cut off completely on the west, making the scheme still an architectural one.

Ms. Feldman's second question was, is the Memorial Plaza a sunken open room or an open gathering place? She said it was described as a ceremonial and celebratory gathering place for various kinds of events, but she failed to see how people would move in and out freely, and she wondered where they would sit.

The third question concerned the arched pavilions-- are they triumphal arches or gatehouses? As triumphal arches they would be appropriate for conveying victory and triumph, but they could not be walked though because their north-south axis was blocked by a waterfall.

Ms. Feldman then described a visit to the memorial from each direction and the ways in which access or views would be blocked. She described the dead end at the western terminus, the glare from the white granite, and also the lack of security at night within this enclosed space. She contrasted this memorial with the exhilarating experience of ascending the steps of the Lincoln Memorial.

Ms. Feldman suggested a solution to some of the problems she had described, and that was to turn the sunken area into an amphitheatre; this would give a stronger sense of a natural depression in the Mall and would provide seating and a place to contemplate the Mall and the memorials. The walls should be lowered, the pool lifted so that the breezes could come through, and the granite should be replaced with grass. The curve of the elm trees could be part of the meaning, framing the whole like a living screen. The arches could stand separate in the curve of trees, echoing the setting of the nearby D. C. War Memorial.

Ms. Feldman closed by saying that civilizations are remembered by their monuments and ideas, and the Mall was one of America's greatest. If those who served in World War II could be remembered there not only for their sacrifice but for their legacy of freedom, then perhaps the memorial could achieve transcendence, but it would have to be a work of art

that elevated our understanding of our national identity and our place in history, in the past and in the future.

The Chairman said Ms. Feldman was the last of those who registered to testify, and he thought this was the time for members of the Commission to ask questions, if they had any, of the presenters. He said he had a point he would like clarified and that was about the seating around the pool--would there be a raised coping so that everyone would have his back towards the pool? Mr. St. Florian said that as the plaza was higher than the pool, people would sit facing the water; Mr. Hartman said it would be similar to Pershing Square, where you step down and sit. Ms. Diamonstein asked to be reminded by what percent the pool would be reduced; Mr. St. Florian said it would be 15 percent smaller.

There were no more questions, and at 1:25 p.m. the Chairman called for a lunch break until 2:00 p.m.

The meeting was reconvened at 2:17 p.m. The Chairman thanked everyone who had participated and said the Commission had listened carefully to all the testimony, finding itself in agreement with some but not with other points, but agreeing wholeheartedly with David Childs, who said there was still much to do.

Mr. Brown then read a resolution drawn up by the members. It said that the Commission of Fine Arts unanimously and enthusiastically approved the site plan, location, and concept of the World War II Memorial as presented at its meeting on 21 May. It recognized that beyond this concept approval there would be many opportunities to consider and review details of execution, and it looked forward to a continuing dialogue with those responsible for the design.

Ms. Malino moved that the resolution be accepted as read, Mrs. Brody seconded the motion, and it was carried unanimously. Exhibit A

(The meeting recessed at 2:20 p.m. and was reconvened at the Commission's National Building Museum offices at 2:48 p.m.)

The Chairman called the meeting to order and announced that the President had decided to attend a dinner at the Museum that evening, and so the Secret Service had announced that everyone had to be out of the building by 3:30 p.m. He He said the Commission, in view of this, would try to move as efficiently as possible.

II. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes of the 16 April meeting. The minutes were approved without objection.

B. Dates of next meetings, approved as:

18 June
23 July

C. Introduction of new staff member, Frederick Lindstrom. The Commission welcomed the new architect member of the staff; Mr. Lindstrom was formerly employed by the Historic American Buildings Survey.

III. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

(The agenda order was changed and item III.D. discussed first.)

D. Department of the Treasury, U. S. Mint

CFA 21/MAY/98-6, Fifty states circulating/commemorative quarter. Reverse designs for second through fifth states: Pennsylvania, New Jersey. Georgia, Connecticut. (Previous: CFA 16/APR/98-2; Delaware) Staff member Sue Kohler recalled the review of the Delaware coin, the first of the five coins to be minted in 1999, the first year of ten in the series, or perhaps eleven, if the District and the territories were included. She said the Mint was ready to show the Commission designs for the four remaining state coins for 1999, and she introduced Michael Burke and George Hunter from the Mint.

Ms. Burke showed four designs for the Pennsylvania coin, each using various combinations of the state flower, bird, emblem and motto; one showed William Penn shaking hands with an Indian chief. The Commission's first choice showed a keystone in the center with the state bird, the grouse, at the top, and branches of mountain laurel at each side. The second choice showed the grouse in the center, flanked by other state symbols; the third choice featured an allegorical female figure in front of an outline of the state with a keystone and the state motto. The design showing William Penn was not considered acceptable.

Of the three designs for the New Jersey coin, the Commission preferred the one reproducing the famous painting by Leutze of Washington Crossing the Delaware, with an inscription below, "Crossroads of the Revolution". The second

choice consisted of three elements; an equestrian portrait of George Washington, an outline of the state, and the Barnegat lighthouse. The third choice showed only the lighthouse, with the motto, "Liberty and Prosperity".

The first of the four designs from Georgia emphasized the state's Hope Scholarships, with appropriate symbols placed in front of an outline of the state; this design was not considered acceptable. The one favored had an outline of the state in the center, with the state motto, a peach placed off-center, slightly overlapping the state outline, and branches of the Cherokee rose at each side. The second and third choices used similar combinations of state symbols.

Ms. Burke said Connecticut had sent in only one concept--the Charter Oak. She showed three versions; the semi-abstract version was not considered acceptable; of the other two, the one showing the tree without leaves was preferred. Exhibit B

(The Commission then returned to the order of submissions on the written agenda.)

A. National Park Service

1. CFA 21/MAY/98-2, Lafayette Square. North side security modifications. Bollard design in street right-of-way; Jackson Place and Madison Place. (Previous: 19/MAR/98-1) The Assistant Secretary recalled the previous submission and the Commission's dislike of the constriction of the Jackson and Madison Place intersections with H Street, which interfered with the historic streetscape of Lafayette Square. The recommendation was that the Park Service consider using a masonry bollard in the street, maintaining the original curb and curb line. He introduced Michael Summerlin to show new drawings.

Mr. Summerlin showed simulated computer drawings of how the granite bollards would like and said they had picked the design from other hitching posts; Mr. Carson added that the paving for the crosswalk would be granite also. The members were pleased with the response and unanimously approved the revised design. Exhibit C

2. CFA 21/MAY/98-3, National Japanese American Memorial. Louisiana Avenue between New Jersey Avenue and D Street, N.W. Landscape and sculpture elements. Design development. (Previous: CFA 20/NOV/97-8.) The Assistant Secretary noted that a major change was being proposed--removal of the bas-reliefs on the wall--and a new way of incorporating the bell motif, as well as a landscape plan. He asked John Parsons from the Park Service to begin the presentation.

The Chairman said the Commission had read Mr. Parsons's letter regarding the sculpture change, and Mr. Parsons said that was what he was going to talk about. Mr. Brown said the Commission was in favor of "less is more" and would not want to detract from the principal sculpture, but wanted to make sure that people had enough information.

Mr. Parsons asked architect Davis Buckley to go into the details. Mr. Buckley showed a drawing of what had been proposed previously, and then one showing the wall with nothing but text; it would name the ten internment camps and give the number of those interned, and then there would be a story line which would continue on the wall all the way around the central crane sculpture, and he read the proposed inscription, which explained that 115,000 persons had been interned behind barbed wire in hastily-built camps in isolated areas; one-third were immigrants to the United States seeking freedom and opportunity; two-thirds were American-born, proud of their American citizenship. Beneath this story line would be four quotations. Mr. Buckley said he thought the difference between the two versions was that the bas-reliefs placed more emphasis on the past.

The Chairman said the only drawback to the relief sculpture was that it tended to make the memorial become more like a magazine article, and that could easily lessen the emotional impact. He thought that with all the information provided by the story line, people would know immediately what the main sculpture was about; he said he considered the change a great improvement even though the Commission had been enthusiastic about the quality of the bas-reliefs.

Ms. Diamonstein thought the memorial was much more powerful with the inscriptions, and she thought that was instructive in terms of the World War II Memorial and any others that might come along. She commented on the crane sculpture, saying that it was very moving and evocative, almost telling the whole dreadful tale in one image. She thought also that with the Matisse sculpture, almost in apposition, the past and the future were signaled in a very dramatic way.

Mr. Buckley commented that the new treatment of the wall had come about as the result of discussions with John Parsons. Nina Akamu, the sculptor, had suggested that the bas-relief images might be used in conjunction with a longer story line for a brochure that could be placed on the site.

Mr. Buckley then discussed the planting plan. The Chairman asked if the staff had an opinion on it, and the Assistant Secretary said they had found it simple and reasonable from a maintenance and visual point of view.

The last item discussed was Paul Matisse's bell. Mr. Buckley recalled the vertical version seen before, and the Chairman commented that the Commission had been nervous about it because of the possible competition with the crane sculpture. Mr. Buckley said Mr. Matisse had decided that it should be a horizontal bell, and after studying its placement, decided that it should not be in a separate grotto, as proposed previously, but incorporated into the wall, actually above it so that people could not reach it easily. There would be enough screening behind the bell to mask the AFL-CIO building across the way. He said his sketches of the yoke that would hold the bell were not accurate, and that the bell would now be suspended in a circular yoke.

There was no further discussion; the members were pleased with the design changes and the landscape plan, and they were all unanimously approved. Exhibit D

B. The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

CFA 21/MAY/98-4, Roof terrace safety railing. Design development, preferred scheme. (Previous: CFA 19/FEB/98-5.) Staff member José Martínez recalled the Commission's previous recommendation that horizontal cables be used below the top bar of the railing to maintain the nautical experience of the terrace. He said the Kennedy Center had decided to follow this recommendation and had prepared a design, which he showed to the members. Mr. Martínez noted that the architects had not yet resolved the issue of the panel design, which would be submitted later.

Ms. Malino asked if it would be possible for children to climb up the cables and over the edge. The Chairman and Mr. Carson pointed out that the inward-leaning profile which would make this nearly impossible. Mr. Martínez said there remained the matter of how the panels would be attached to the cables, but that would be discussed when the panels were submitted. The cable design was then unanimously approved. Exhibit E

C. Department of the Army

CFA 21/MAY/98-5, Fort Myer, physical fitness center. Parking area and landscape. Design. Mr. Martínez said the Commission had approved a design for the fitness center in November 1993, and now the Army was submitting plans for landscaping and parking for the center. Mr. Carson showed an aerial photograph, pointing out the location of the fitness center and the old commissary, which would be the site of the parking lot. Jim Long, from A. Morton Thomas, the civil engineers and landscape architects on the project, was then introduced.

Mr. Long said he had gone through several layouts for the parking lot, and by eliminating a service road originally planned, he had been able to provide a better parking layout as well as landscaping within the lot. He also showed plans for landscaping at the entrance to the fitness center and behind nearby Quarters 349, which also included the expansion of the playground in that location.

The members were especially pleased with the addition of trees within the parking lot and unanimously approved the project. Exhibit F

E. General Services Administration/Department of State

CFA 21/MAY/98-7, Main State Building, 21st and C streets, N.W. Security bollards and planters; three locations. Optional designs. The Assistant Secretary said the State Department was seeking protection for three of its principal entrances, using bollards and planters. The bollards would be mostly hydraulic, but there would be a few fixed ones at the sidewalk. Mr. Carson said he understood the material would be a brushed stainless steel, and the bollards would probably have lights at night, so they could be seen by drivers. He said Mr. Frank Carpency from Cetrom Engineers had prepared a computer-based presentation showing the proposed installations.

While Mr. Carpency was setting up his presentation, the Chairman suggested going ahead with the Georgetown and Shipstead-Luce submissions. Mr. Martínez informed him that when the staff heard the Commission would have to leave the building by 3:30, the applicants had been called and the Georgetown and Shipstead submissions had been postponed until the June meeting. (Items F.1.a and b; F.2.a and b) The Appendices, however, remained on the agenda, and they were dealt with while waiting for Mr. Carpency.

F. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

c. Appendix I. After a word of explanation from Mr. Martínez in regard to the withdrawal of O.G. 98-111, the Appendix was approved without objection.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

c. Appendix II. The Appendix was approved without objection.

Mr. Carpency then began his presentation of the State Department security bollards and planters. He said they had been given certain security requirements to meet with the bollard system, and had also had to meet requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The third requirement was to maintain the aesthetics of the existing architecture. Mr. Carpency began by showing drawings of the bollards and planters proposed for the Diplomatic Entrance on C Street. The bollards in this location would be stainless steel to complement the aluminum trim at the entrance. Bollards at the congressional parking entrance were shown next, and Mr. Carpency noted that the controls for both these entrances would be housed in one kiosk. Bollards at the 21st Street entrance would be a bronze color to match the trim on that part of the building, and they would be controlled from a kiosk in the area. Mr. Carpency then showed pictures of the metal bollards, which would have an integral red safety light at the top and a Department of State insignia etched or stamped below. He also showed a somewhat larger granite-clad bollard, used for most of the fixed locations.

The Chairman asked Mr. Carpency to return to the drawing of the Diplomatic Entrance installation. He noted that the function of the fixed and hydraulic bollards was markedly different, and he thought the fixed metal bollards on the sidewalk at this entrance looked intrusive; using planters instead, he thought, would give a more welcoming impression. The other members agreed, and with their permission, the task of working this out with Mr. Carpency was delegated to the staff. All other parts of the submission were unanimously approved. Exhibit G

The meeting was adjourned at 3:43 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton,
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT A

May 26, 1998

Dear Ambassador Williams:

At its public meeting on May 21, the Commission voted and passed the following resolution:

> RESOLVED: That the Commission of Fine Arts unanimously and enthusiastically approves the site plan, location, and concept of the World War II Memorial as presented at its meeting today, May 21, 1998.
>
> The Commission recognizes that beyond this concept approval will be many opportunities to consider and review details of execution, and looks forward to a continuing dialogue with those responsible for the design.

In introducing it, the members wanted to be sure that I referred to the phrase in David Childs' presentation, that "there is still a lot to be done." In our deliberations, we catalogued and discussed various elements that we need to discuss with the designers in some detail.

Although so many comments of witnesses in opposition to the site and design we felt were off the mark, there was one recurring theme with which we cannot but agree. The final memorial must, if possible, be a true work of art, and to that end, must possess an artistic unity and an emotional impact through which the whole adds up to more than the sum of its parts.

The component elements that the Commission feels need work, or at least a definition, are quite numerous. They include the following:

1) The single element with which the Commission had the most trouble was the design of the gateway arches. The majority seemed to agree with the height and scale as indicated by the mock-up scaffolding on the site inspection. However, there was considerable difficulty with the heaviness of the design as indicated in the conceptual model, particularly with the upper portion. The wreath idea, on the other hand, seemed to find favor universally.

Many of the members, independently, felt quite strongly that the gateways would be better rendered in metallic outline. This would accomplish a greater transparency, and obviate putting too much architectural weight at the outer perimeter, which now makes it difficult to gather the energy of the overall composition into the middle, given the restraints there of interfering with the pre-existing vista. The metallic approach would be more gardenesque in reference, allow the space and views to flow through better, and yet, given their height and proportions, could soar and give the sense of uplift that we believe the memorial should deliver.

2) The Commission agrees that a floral element, green and white, will be a great addition, and looks forward to seeing how you propose to incorporate that.

3) The flagpoles are a welcome addition, and we look forward to seeing a design for the base, the height, the tops of the poles, and the size of the flags, which we feel should be very generous.

4) The question of focus in the center is crucial, and the Commission is enthusiastic about the proposal for a Torch of Freedom. We look forward to seeing how that idea develops.

5) There was considerable enthusiasm as well for some sculptural element in the pool. One idea would be a freely rendered and artistically successful reference to the essential American logo, the eagle, holding an olive branch in one claw and a thunderbolt in the other, symbolizing both the peaceful objectives of World War II and the means utilized to achieve them, all embodied in a universally recognizable, historic, and stirring patriotic motif. It could be horizontal, slightly above the water surface, and not solid, and still be able to be read well from various levels, including the view from the top of the Washington Monument, without impacting the major axis. It could, if some judicious, partial gilding is proposed in the laurel wreaths, tie in with them, and also possibly with the torch.

6) The design of the perimeter screen elements was felt to need considerable work. The basic concept is excellent, providing transparency and yet defining the space, and helping fill in the understory of the trees below which one is now distracted by the cars rushing past. The opportunity it gives for iconography is welcome. We disagree with the speaker who thought that the states were irrelevant; the idea of referring to both states and territories is a brilliant one. This does not preclude, however, incorporating at quite small scale all kinds of divisional shoulder patches or other symbology, some possibly quite informal, offering interest, a recall of the times, and places for visitors to lay memorial offerings. There was difficulty with the silhouette of the top ridge of the grillage as proposed.

(Some thoughts for the grille have occurred to me since the meeting, and I offer them informally for what they are worth. For the top, one approach might be a wave effect, to symbolize both the degree to which the oceans, as well as new wave-based technologies–such as radar–were relevant to the effort. For the grille itself, one might look at a horizontal weaving, which could express the degree to which the states and territories, and both civilians and the military, were bound together. -- If both motifs were adopted, the sine-curve reference would be expressed both in plan and elevation.)

7) The Commission felt that more seating would be essential. We understand the difficulty of converting the whole plaza area into a reflective white marble amphitheater, overly constricting the space around the pool. However, some slope to the grassy end pieces could help the sight lines and encourage those areas for seating at times of performances or assemblies.

8) The question of western access bothered some of the members a great deal. It may be that some stairs should be incorporated to the side of the "sacred precinct" area, particularly if they were hidden in such a way as not to open up a visual gap.

9) The question of lighting will be needing study. Some attention should be paid to the theory that it would interfere with the reflections of the existing monuments at night.

Many other elements we recognize are still in process. We need to consider:

10) inscriptions, avoiding overload;
11) relief or other sculpture;
12) the exact configuration of the water jets and the look of the water at various settings;
13) signage;
14) the overall landscaping, particularly around the access road.

Finally, the Commission felt strongly that its ultimate approval will be conditional on proof of some maintenance program that will keep the pool pristine and the whole area up to the appropriate standard.

We realize that in many cases you have already given these issues great thought. As we stressed, we look forward to not holding up the expeditious realization of the memorial, and are happy to work with you on a frequent basis. With congratulations on the vast improvement in the design to date,

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable F. Haydn Williams
American Battle Monuments Commission
Courthouse Plaza II, Suite 500
2300 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22201

cc: General Frederick F. Woerner, Jr.
American Battle Monuments Commission
Harvey Gantt
National Capital Planning Commission
Robert Stanton
National Park Service

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT B

2 June 1998

Dear Mr. Diehl:

At its meeting on 21 May the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for the reverse of the fifty states commemorative quarters honoring Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut. The Commission's choices were as follows:

Pennsylvania: The Commission's first choice showed a keystone in the center, containing the words "Keystone State". The keystone was flanked with sprays of mountain laurel, the state flower; and the state bird, the ruffed grouse, was shown above the keystone. The second choice placed the grouse in the center, surrounded by other state symbols and the motto, "Virtue, Liberty, and Independence"; the third choice had an allegorical figure in front of an outline of the state, as well as a keystone and the state motto.

New Jersey: The first choice was based on the Leutze painting, "Washington Crossing the Delaware", with the words, "Crossroads of the Revolution" below. The second choice showed Washington on horseback, an outline of the state, and the Barnegat lighthouse. The third choice featured the lighthouse and the state motto, "Liberty and Prosperity".

Georgia: The preference was for a design showing an outline of the state in the center, containing the motto "Wisdom, Justice, Moderation", and flanked by the state flower; a Georgia peach was placed off-center, slightly overlapping the outline of the state. The second choice also showed an outline of the state, with a Georgia peach in the center, flanked by sprigs of live oak, with a ribbon knotted into three sections above, containing the words "Wisdom, Justice, Moderation". The third choice again showed the state outline in the center, with the state flower and bird and a star marking the location of Atlanta.

Connecticut: Two versions of the Charter Oak (the only concept submitted) were considered acceptable. The preference was for the one showing the tree without leaves, with a section of a stone wall next to it on the right and the words "The Charter Oak" on the left.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable Philip N. Diehl, Director
United States Mint
633 Third Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20220

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT C

2 June 1998

Dear Mr. McDaniel:

During its meeting of 21 May 1998, the Commission reviewed and approved a revised design for security elements on the north side of Lafayette Square at Jackson Place and Madison Place. The members were pleased with the simplified scheme that retained the historic curbing and grade and added stone-clad bollards to the existing road beds.

Again, it is hoped that the Commission soon will see a unified, overall plan for Lafayette Square and Pennsylvania Avenue. Current conditions leave much to be desired.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. James I. McDaniel
Director, White House Liaison Office
National Park Service, NCR
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT D

2 June 1998

Dear Mr. Carlstrom:

During its meeting of 21 May 1998, the Commission reviewed and approved revisions to the design for the proposed National Japanese American Memorial on Louisiana Avenue. Much as the bas-relief by Nina Akamu was admired, its replacement by a series of dramatic quotations will strengthen the overall design by focusing primary attention on the bound cranes.

The bell, by Paul Matisse, has vastly improved also. As a vertical element, it was difficult to resolve; both the bell and the cranes seemed destined to conflict. However, as a horizontal motif set within the wall, all conflict has been resolved. The bell is bound to be a highlight of any tour of the memorials and monuments of Washington and the members are pleased by the outcome.

Our next focus likely should be the quotations, their placement and text as well as the lettering style chosen. The graphics of the lettering will be essential to the success of the design. In this case, the quotes are intended to tell a difficult story and must be selected with care.

As you know, the staff is available as questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Terry R. Carlstrom
Regional Director, National Capital Region
National Park Service
P.O. Box 37127
Washington, D.C. 20013-7127

cc: Davis Buckley

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT E

2 June 1998

Dear Mr. Wilker:

During its meeting 21 May 1998, the Commission reviewed and approved the revised design using cables for the new safety railing proposed for the roof terrace at the Kennedy Center. They have the virtue of retaining their shape as long as they are kept uniformly taut. To achieve this end, we understand you will be using turnbuckles.

We look forward to the review of these details, as well as those of the proposed interpretive panels, as they are developed.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Larry Wilker, President
The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts
Washington, D.C. 20566-0001

cc: Mr. James Kirkman
Project Executive - Kennedy Center

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT F

2 June 1998

Dear Mr. Sweger:

During its meeting 21 May 1998, the Commission reviewed and approved the design and landscaping for the proposed parking lot for the Physical Fitness Center at Fort Myer. The members were pleased to note that the landscaping will be an integral element of the parking lot, serving to enhance what otherwise would be a barren paved area. The new landscaping behind Quarters 439, and the expansion of the playground will be an improvement over current conditions.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Jim Sweger
Baltimore District Corps of Engineers
CENAB-EN-MM
P.O. Box 1715
Baltimore, MD 21203

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT G

2 June 1998

Dear Mr. Finberg:

During its meeting of 21 May 1998, the Commission reviewed the design and placement of new security bollards for three locations at the Main State Department Building: the Congressional parking area, Diplomatic entrance, and 21st Street entrance. The matt-finished stainless steel hydraulic bollards (anodized bronze at the 21st Street entrance) are approved, as are the proposed planters/ mechanical units at the Diplomatic entrance. There is, however, one segment of the design that could be improved.

The proposed sidewalk bollards at the Diplomatic entrance are inappropriate. The Commission recommends replacing the paired bollards with single planters, similar in character to the existing and proposed planters. Rather than overwhelming the pedestrian, they could be no more than 30 inches in height.

The Commission recommends working out the details with the staff.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Jack Finberg
Special Assistant for Regional Coordination
General Services Administration, NCR
7th and D streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20407